

**Notice of Allowability**

Application No.

09/603,108

Examiner

Thomas Duong

Applicant(s)

SERENYI ET AL.

Art Unit

2145

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--**

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to August 1, 2006.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-6, 8, 10-13, 15-20, 69-74, 76-88, 137-139, 141-142, and 145.
3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of the:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.

**THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.**

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
- (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
- 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

**Attachment(s)**

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material
5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6. ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
7. ☐ Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

  
**JASON CARDONE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. The Applicants' arguments and amendments filed on August 1, 2006 have been fully considered and are persuasive.

### *Allowable Subject Matter*

2. *Claims 1-6, 8, 10-13, 15-20, 69-74, 76-88, 137-139, 141-142, and 145 are allowed. The claims indicated include limitations that the prior arts of record do not appear to teach or render obvious, hence they are allowed.*
3. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:  
  
As presented in the previous Office Action, Lambert et al. (US006629138B1) discloses, *"a subscriber's requests to retrieve certain published content"* (Lambert, col.6, lines 3-4), which causes the *"web browser 100 then [sending] an HTTP request to a remote caching server 204. In response, caching server 204 either retrieves cached content from cache 300 or sends an HTTP request via the Internet to a publisher's machine to retrieve non-cached content"* (Lambert, col.6, lines 8-12). Hence, Lambert discloses method for receiving requests for streaming media data from the users; and, in response to the requests, retrieving the streaming media data from data servers, storing the streaming media data at a caching proxy server, and finally streaming the media data to the requested users. Also presented in the previous Office Action, Hoffman et al. (RFC 2250: RTP Payload Format for MPEG1/MPEG2 Video) teaches *of the use of a code ID*

*in the header extension field of the RTP Payload Format for MPEG1/MPEG2 Video to denote and identify each specific extension for which they stand for.*

However, the prior arts of record fail to teach or suggest individually or in combination as stated in the independent claims for *"transmitting a request for one or more Real-Time Protocol ("RTP") header extensions associated with said streaming media data, wherein each of said one or more RTP header extensions represents a type of related or unrelated data that is necessary for performing a particular transmission operation for a packet of said streaming media data; receiving said streaming media data and storing said streaming media data on a storage device which is capable of being controlled by said caching proxy server; and receiving said one or more RTP header extensions associated with said streaming media data, wherein each of said one or more RTP header extensions is a sub-extension in an extensible extended RTP header of the packet of said streaming media data, wherein the sub-extension has a sub-extension name code and data, wherein the sub-extension name code uniquely identifies and describes the type of the data in the sub-extension, and a sub-extension identification (ID) identifying the sub-extension within each RTP packet."* and in combination with other limitations as set forth in the independent claims, as well as Applicants' arguments presented on pages 17-20 of the amendment filed on August 1, 2006. In the fore mentioned amendment, the Applicants argued, *"in contrast, amended claim 1 refers to transmitting a request for one or more Real-Time Protocol ("RTP") header extensions associated with said streaming media data wherein each of said one or more RTP header extensions represents a type of related or unrelated data that is necessary for performing a particular transmission operation for a packet of said streaming media data. Additionally, Hoffman fails to disclose receiving said one or more RTP header*

Art Unit: 2145

*extensions associated with said streaming media data, wherein each of said one or more RTP header extensions is a sub-extension in an extensible extended RTP header of the packet of said streaming media data, wherein the sub-extension has a sub-extension name code and data, wherein the sub-extension name code uniquely identifies and describes the type of the data in the sub-extension, and a sub-extension identification (ID) identifying the sub-extension within each RTP packet, as recited in amended claim 1" (pg.18-20).*


Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

#### **Conclusion**

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Duong whose telephone number is 571/272-3911. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 4:00PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason D. Cardone can be reached on 571/272-3933. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571/273-8300 for regular communications and 571/273-8300 for After Final communications.

Thomas Duong (AU2145)

October 16, 2006



Jason D. Cardone

Supervisory PE (AU2145)